

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/687,096	VOELZ, JAMES L.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Sara W. Crane	2811	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Sara W. Crane. (3) \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) Aaron Poledna. (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 09 August 2006.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: of record.

Identification of prior art discussed: of record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: We discussed the aspect of the independent claims wherein the protective layer on the backside is applied prior to the separation of the dies. The independent claims do recite that the "dies" are a distinct feature, as compared to the "workpiece" itself, but the examiner is not completely sure that this separate designation would imply that the workpiece, as it is being covered, must consist of dies that are then to be separated. We discussed the possibility of a clarifying amendment, stating specifically that the covering of the workpiece backside takes place prior to separation of dies. Examiner agrees that this would overcome the rejection of record. Support for the amendment would be found in, for example, figure 2 of the specification, and the advantages of such a method are noted at, for example, paragraphs [0032] and [0033] of the specification.